

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 27 2007

REMARKS

1 Claims 1-20 have presented in the above-identified
2 U.S. Patent Application.

3
4 Claims 2, 5-7, 11, 16 and 17 have been withdrawn from
5 consideration in response to a Restriction Requirement as
6 described in Paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

7
8 Claims 21-23 have been added by this Amendment A.

9
10 Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12-15 and 18-23 are in the
11 Application and reconsideration of the Application is
12 hereby respectfully requested.

13
14 Referring to Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Claim
15 12 has been objected to because of a Claim informality
16 kindly pointed out by Examiner. Claim 12 has been amended
17 to remove the Claim informality. Therefore, objection to
18 Claim 12 has been answered by amendment.

19
20 Referring to Paragraph 4, Claims 15, 18, 19, and 20
21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,
22 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out
23 and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant
24 regards as the invention. The ambiguity in the Claims
25 identified by Examiner, an inconsistency in the use of
26 "signal group/groups", is believed to have been corrected
27 by the amendments to the Claims. Therefore, rejection of

1 Claims 15, 18, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second
2 paragraph, has been answered by amendment.

3

4 Referring to Paragraph 7 of the Office Action, Claims
5 1, 3, 9, 10, 12-14, 15, and 19 have been rejected under 35
6 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication
7 2005/0003781 issued in the name of Kunz et al (hereinafter
8 referred to as Kunz). Referring to Paragraph 9 of the
9 Office Action, Claims 4, 8, and 20 have been rejected under
10 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunz (cited
11 above) in view of U.S. Patent 4,989,204 issued in the name
12 of Shimizu et al (hereinafter referred to as Shimizu).

13

14 Before considering the relationship of the references
15 and the Claims, the present invention, as defined by the
16 amended Claims, will be summarized. Almost from the
17 beginning of the fabrication of integrated circuits, the
18 goal has been to include in the chips an increasing number
19 of components. This increasing number of components has
20 been possible because of the decreasing dimensions of the
21 individual components. In addition, the number of bits
22 being simultaneously processed has been steadily
23 increasing. For example, data groups being processed have
24 expanded from 4 bits to 128 bits. With the decreasing
25 component dimensions along with the increasing component
26 complexity, the problem of entering signal groups into the
27 semiconductor chips has been an increasingly difficult
28 problem. The conducting paths themselves have approached
29 the limits as to what can be physically manipulated. A
30 practical technique of transferring logic signal groups

1 from chip-to-chip has proven an extremely difficult
2 technological problem. Various techniques, such as the
3 multiplexing of chip interface terminals, have been used
4 with mixed success.

5
6 The solution to this problem as disclosed in the
7 present Application and described in the Claims of the
8 Application is to provide a non-conducting path between the
9 semiconductor chips. This non-conducting path removes the
10 problem of the physical conducting paths at the cost of an
11 increase in the number of components used to effect a
12 wireless transfer of signal groups. However, the component
13 miniaturization has made it more convenient to accommodate
14 additional components on each chip as compared to providing
15 additional chip-to-chip conducting paths. The Claims, as
16 amended, clearly indicate that the signal transmitting
17 component and the signal receiving component are chips
18 located on the same integrated circuit board or the same
19 semiconductor substrate. This relationship is clearly
20 present in the independent Claims 1, 9, and 15.
21 Furthermore, the decreased dimensions of the distance
22 between the semiconductor chips themselves require
23 relatively little power to transfer wireless signals there
24 between. In addition, once the receiving and the
25 transmitting components have been designed and tested, the
26 incorporation of these components for wireless transmission
27 can be incorporated in a catalog of chips that can be
28 fabricated conveniently.

29

1 Referring once again to the references, the Kunz
2 reference describes and claims a wireless receiver unit,
3 the thrust of the invention being the technique for
4 processing the incoming wireless signals. Nowhere in the
5 Kunz reference is there any teaching of the transmission of
6 information between two components on a circuit board.
7 Indeed, nowhere in the Kunz reference is any indication of
8 the source or the location of the wireless transmitting
9 units that provide the signals for the disclosed circuit to
10 manipulate. Therefore, the invention sought to be
11 protected by the amended Claims is not claimed, disclosed,
12 or even suggested by the Kunz reference. Consequently,
13 rejection of Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 12-14, 15, and 19 is
14 respectfully traversed.

15
16 Referring to the Shimizu reference, this reference
17 discloses apparatus for improving the receipt of a wireless
18 signal from a transmitter that is crossing boundaries of
19 cell phone area. Clearly the movement of the wireless
20 transmitter is unrelated to the transfer of signal groups
21 from one semiconductor chip to a second semiconductor chip
22 on the same substrate or on the same integrated circuit.
23 Even when the transmitting and receiving chips are on
24 different circuit boards, the position of the transmitting
25 wireless unit is fixed relative to the receiving wireless
26 unit. Thus, the Shimizu reference in no way makes up for
27 the shortcomings of the configuration described by the Kunz
28 reference. The references, either alone or together, do
29 not relate to the configuration of the Patent Application
30 in which, to avoid the use of conducting paths, signal

1 groups are transmitted by wireless techniques between chips
2 on a circuit board or integrated circuit board. Therefore,
3 rejection of Claims 4, 8, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as
4 being unpatentable over Kunz in view of Shimizu is
5 respectfully traversed.

6

7 Consequently, it is believed that Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-
8 10, 12-15 and 18-23, all the Claims now in the Application,
9 are in condition for allowance.


RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 27 2007

CONCLUSION

1 In view of the foregoing discussion and the foregoing
2 amendments, it is believed that Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12-15
3 and 18-23 are now in condition for allowance and allowance
4 of Claims 1, 3, 4, 8-10, 12-15 and 18-23 is respectfully
5 requested. Applicant(s) hereby respectfully request a
6 timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this Application.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Holloway
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 26,182

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(281) 274-4064
Dated: 03/14/07